

Serial No.: 10/751,153
Group Art Unit: 2616
Examiner: Frank Duong

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 remain in this application with claims 1, 7, 9 and 11 being independent claims. Claims 1, 7, 9 and 11 have been amended.

Claim Objections

In the present official action, claims 7, 9 and 11 were objected to for certain informalities. In particular the first occurrence of the acronym "DVMRP" in each of the claims needs to be spelled out. Applicants have amended these claims to spell out the acronym as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections

In the present official action, independent claims 1, 7, 9 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Pusateri (Distance Vector Multicast Routing Protocol, Internet Draft, pages 1-2, August 1998) (hereinafter "Pusateri"). Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 7, 9 and 11, and respectfully assert that these claims, as now presented are not taught, anticipated or rendered obvious in view of Pusateri.

In particular Applicants have amended each of these claims to include the limitation of "the destination-based forwarding router being unable to make multicast routing decisions based on the multicast source address". Support for which can be found at least in the present application in paragraph [0020]. In fact, this is address the problem that the present invention overcomes as set forth in paragraph [0008]. "In some multicast routers, however, the source address is ignored and only the destination group address and the incoming interface are used as criteria for routing multicast traffic. If uncorrected, such a router has the potential to cause multicast storms...."

In direct contrast to the invention as now presented, Pusateri, requires use of the source address when making multicast routing decisions, especially in utilizing Reverse Path Multicasting (RPM), (see for example Pusateri, section 1.2) wherein datagrams are transmitted back "to the source" then forwarded to the appropriate downstream interfaces, i.e. the source address is being utilized in making multicast routing decisions. In fact, if Pusateri were to be modified as is presently claimed, that which is disclosed Pusateri would be rendered in-operable.

Serial No.: 10/751,153
Group Art Unit: 2616
Examiner: Frank Duong

Therefore, as each and every element of the present invention is not disclosed in Pusateri, and further if Pusateri were to be modified as is presently claimed, it would be rendered in-operable, Applicants respectfully assert that the present invention is patentable over Pusateri.

Regarding the rejections of claims 2-6, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Regarding the rejections of claim 8, as this claims depends directly from independent claim 7, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 7, Applicants respectfully assert that this claim is also patentable over the cited references.

Regarding the rejections of claim 10, as this claims depends directly from independent claim 9, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 9, Applicants respectfully assert that this claim is also patentable over the cited references.

Regarding the rejections of claims 12-15, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 11, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 11, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Serial No.: 10/751,153
Group Art Unit: 2616
Examiner: Frank Duong

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, the foregoing amendment places the Application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact the undersigned at 512-306-8533.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 7, 2007

By: 
..... Raymond M. Galasso
..... Reg. No. 37,832

Galasso & Associates, LP
P.O. Box 26503
Austin, Texas 78755-0503
Telephone: (512) 306-8533
Facsimile: (512) 306-8559